



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### III. PROBLEMS IN DELPHIAN CHRONOLOGY.

The Aitolians and King Antigonos of Makedon practically divided between them the control of Greece from 275-250 B. C. The former of these gained both power and prestige as a result of their defense of the Delphic shrine against the Gauls. They not only regarded Delphi as their peculiar sphere of influence but, as the Aitolian League grew in strength and numbers, they also began to dominate the proceedings of the Amphiktyonic Council. By the time Antigonos had definitely secured his position on the throne, he found himself a hopeless minority at the Council in the number of votes which he controlled. Liable to be outvoted with consequent loss of prestige, he adopted a policy of non-participation which he imposed on all states dependent on Makedon. In studying the Amphiktyonic records of the second half of the third century, we base our chronological scheme on the theory that this policy became traditional in Makedon and was never departed from.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, when we find Athens sending a delegate to the Council, we assume that the city was independent. No such restrictions were imposed on those states not directly controlled by Makedon but bound to her on the basis of a free and independent alliance. For example, Boiotia, allied to Makedon from the Demetrian war until the end of the century, sent her delegates to the Council save when at war with Aitolia.

The policy of Antigonos was also adopted by the Achaian League and probably for the same reasons. Both may have resented the policy of the Aitolians in regard to Delphi, as well as their unprecedented method of increasing their vote in the Council as they expanded their League. At any rate it is clear that any state possessing an Amphiktyonic vote ceased to exercise it on entering the Achaian League or on coming under Makedonian control.

Between 250 and 240 B. C. Greece enjoyed a period of comparative peace. We should expect to find a goodly number of

<sup>1</sup> The documents from 280-240 are discussed in AJP 1918, 145 ff.

records of the Soteria or of the Council meetings in these years, but we have nothing save a decree in honor of the philosopher Lykon, which probably dates ca. 248. By some curious chance all the other Amphiktyonic lists have disappeared unless we are to transfer to this period some of those which we have dated at the end of the century.

In the following decade war broke out between Aitolia and Demetrios. Since the former suffered severely we should not expect to find many epigraphical records during the war. The ancient historians tell us very little about the struggle beyond the fact that Demetrios won for himself the nickname *Aitolikos*.<sup>1</sup> This implies that the fortunes of war went strongly against the Aitolian forces. Boiotia deserted the League and joined Demetrios early in the war. From an Attic inscription we learn that the war began in the archonship of Lysias and that it was not ended in the archonship of Lysanias.<sup>2</sup> It may have been brought to an end by the Dardanian invasion of Makedon. At least it is certain that Demetrios was engaged in a desperate struggle with these tribes in the latter part of his reign, was defeated by them, and apparently lost his life in battle or as a result of wounds. Whatever the date of the war, we believe that there can be no reasonable doubt that Aitolia suffered severely, losing part of her League, and that Pomtow and Walek are justified in their arguments for placing Group VI of the Amphiktyonic records in the reign of Demetrios.<sup>3</sup>

The problem of dating Group VI more precisely is facilitated by several lines of evidence. The succession of certain archons is known. Eukles follows Thessalos and precedes Athambos.<sup>4</sup> Damaïos is followed by Damosthenes who is, with reasonable

<sup>1</sup> Strabo X 451. Niese gives the details of the war in *Gesch. der gr. und mak. Staaten* II 286 ff.

<sup>2</sup> SIG I<sup>a</sup> 485. In line 65 of this inscription it is better to restore *ἐπὶ Λυσάρου* than *ἐπὶ Ἐκφάντου* since elision is followed wherever possible. Ekphantos is dated in 237/6; Lysanias in 236/5 (AJP 1913, 381 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Walek, *Die delphische Amphiktyonie in der Zeit der aitolischen Herrschaft*, 114 ff.; Pomtow, *Klio* 1914, 265 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Klio* 1914, 291. Bourguet is inclined to place Eukles about 212 on prosopographical evidence which he publishes in *Rev. Arch.* 1917, 339. This date is much too late and the acceptance of it is impossible because of the violent fluctuation in the membership of the League which is involved in it.

probability, dated in the year of the Pythic games.<sup>1</sup> The membership of the Amphiktyonic Council shows that Boiotia and Aitolia were at peace; that Athens was independent of Makedon in the archonship of Athambos; and that Aigina acted with Athens in asserting her freedom for she had a delegate at the Council in the same archonship.

Walek explains the presence of the Athenian delegate at the Council in the archonship of Athambos as an act of grace on the part of Demetrios. Dating Athambos in 236 he builds up the theory that the war with Aitolia had ended and a hasty peace concluded to enable Demetrios to return home to meet the Dardanians. As a token of the concord established between the two nations, an Athenian delegate was sent to the Council. Pomtow has accepted this theory but it rests on very unsubstantial evidence, or rather, on none at all. The war could not have ended in 236 as the evidence of Attic inscriptions shows.<sup>2</sup> Moreover we cannot believe that Demetrios ever broke with the traditional policy of Makedon in allowing any of the subject states to participate in the deliberations of the Council. Had he done so, it would be inexplicable that Athens alone should be allowed the privilege. If Demetrios had wished to signify the renewal of amicable relations by sending a delegate to the Council, we should reasonably expect Makedon to have exercised her privilege rather than a subordinate member of the empire. We believe that Walek's theory must be discarded and that the Athenian hieromnemon at the Council in Athambos' year must be explained on the basis of Athenian independence. We have shown elsewhere that Athens shook off the domination of Makedon in 232 and we accordingly date Athambos in that year.<sup>3</sup> This we take as the pivotal point for dating Group VI.

Pomtow has given good reasons for dating Thessalos, Eukles, and Athambos in successive years, and they should therefore be dated in 234/2.<sup>4</sup> Pythokles of Hermione received Delphic honors in the archonship of Thessalos.<sup>5</sup> In a record of the Soteria he is given as the officiating priest, and it is probable that the honors were conferred in recognition of his services on that occasion.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, we should restore the name of

<sup>1</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 483.

<sup>2</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 485.

<sup>3</sup> AJP 1918, 167 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Klio 1914, 291 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Anec. Delph. 66.

<sup>6</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 489.

the archon in this record as Thessalos, for it fills the lacuna in the first line exactly. Six Aitolians, two Delphians, and one Histiaian formed the Amphiktyonic Council which presided over the games. Neither Athens nor Boiotia was represented, and their absence indicates that the Demetrian war was still in progress. Pomtow has suggested that this record should be assigned to the archonship of Damaios, but the list of Amphiktyons does not correspond with that of his year. An Amphiktyonic list recently published by Pomtow probably belongs to the archonship of Athambos, but it may be dated under Damaios.<sup>1</sup> The presence of an Athenian and a Histiaian at the same time limits the list to this period and excludes that of the Chremonidean war.

The Aiginetan hieromnemon does not reappear after the archonship of Athambos in 232. Lyandros (this was the name of the delegate) received an honorary decree from Delphi in the archonship of Eukles in the preceding year.<sup>2</sup> It is probable that he was present at the spring session of the Council as well. If this is so, it implies that the revolution which gave Athens and Aigina their freedom took place early in the spring of 232. Since Aigina shared the Dorian vote in the Peloponnese with four other states in some kind of rotation, her turn did not come again before she joined the Achaian League.<sup>3</sup> By so doing she followed the plan of other members of that League in abstaining from participation in the proceedings of the Council.

Damaios must be dated in a year preceding the celebration of the Pythic games and he is immediately followed by Damos-thenes.<sup>4</sup> These archons follow Athambos and must be dated in 231/o. Pleiston belongs with Group VI as Walek has shown.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> GGA 1913, 174.

<sup>2</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 482, note 8. It may be noted here that in the discussion of Archelas, the archon in 269, it was suggested that the Aiginetan vote in that archonship might be dated ca. 228 (AJP 1918, 162). Further study shows that this is impossible, as there is no place for an archon of this name here. We must either assume that Aigina gained her independence of Makedon in 269 in time to send a delegate to the spring session of the Council or date the decree in honor of the Aiginetan hieromnemon in a much earlier period.

<sup>3</sup> The date is undetermined, but is probably not later than 229. Niese, *op. cit.* II 289.

<sup>4</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 483, 488.

<sup>5</sup> *op. cit.* 115 ff.

It is probable that he is to be dated in 229. After his archonship the Athenian delegate no longer appears in the records of the Council. The reason for the change of policy can only be determined by conjecture. Apparently the Athenians ceased to participate as Amphiktyons as soon as they gained possession of their harbors and fortresses and became completely independent of Makedon. Diogenes surrendered the ports only after a ransom of 150 talents had been paid. Much of this amount was raised from friendly states. Aratos contributed twenty talents, possibly in the hope that Athens would join the Achaian League. Ptolemy probably gave a large contribution in partial recognition of the creation of the tribe Ptolemais. Some came either as a loan or gift from the Thespians and Thebans, a fact which has some significance in regard to the loyalty of these states to their Makedonian allies.<sup>1</sup> Whether these gifts carried any obligations to Athens in regard to Aitolia we cannot say. The guiding statesmen in the new era of freedom were Mikion and Eurykleides, and they must have realized that the only safe policy for Athens was one of strict neutrality. If they joined either of the great leagues they knew that their country would be the main battle-ground in case of war, and they probably saw that trouble was already brewing. Since Aratos did not succeed in winning Athens to the Achaian League Polybios has no sympathy for Athenian foreign policy and he dismisses the Athenians from his history with the contemptuous remark that, when they gained their independence, they resigned it to Eurykleides and concerned themselves no more with the political life of Greece.<sup>2</sup> We may conclude that the failure of Athens to attend the Council is undoubtedly a part of the policy of neutrality inaugurated by Eurykleides which seems to have been religiously followed for the remainder of his lifetime.

The Boiotian vote at the Council also requires a word of explanation. In the war between Aitolia and Makedon the Boiotians went over to the latter.<sup>3</sup> Apparently this move was voluntary, but the presence of a Makedonian army within their borders may have furnished some incentive. If we can believe Polybios, many of the towns seemed to have made the change

<sup>1</sup> IG VII 1737-8, 2405-6; Ferguson, *Hell. Ath.* 207.

<sup>2</sup> Polybios V 106.

<sup>3</sup> Polybios XX 5.

with reluctance. However, Boiotia now appears as an independent ally of Makedon and not as a subject state. During the war no delegates from Boiotia attended the Council, but in 232 we find them present. We may infer that peace had been concluded between 234, the archonship of Thessalos, and 232. It is interesting to observe that Boiotia had none of the scruples which characterized the policy of Makedon in regard to attending the Council. Hereafter the records show the presence of Boiotians at all times except when actual hostilities prevented their attendance.

An interval must elapse between the archonships of Pleiston and Peithagoras because the Amphiktyonic list in the spring term of the former differs from the membership in the autumn session under Peithagoras.<sup>1</sup> Peithagoras probably belongs to a year of the Pythia, although it is not absolutely certain.<sup>2</sup> If so, he must be dated in 226. We believe that Pomtow is correct in restoring the name of Patrondas in SIG I<sup>3</sup> 506, although the first letter of the archon's name is so indistinct that we may restore Euagoras or Peisilas with equal probability. But Patrondas belongs to this period and it is probable that both Euagoras and Peisilas belong in the reign of Demetrios. The constitution of the Council reveals the fact that the Aitolian League had added four votes to their representation since the archonship of Peithagoras. Since the Boiotians were present, the list must antedate the Kleomenic war or 224 B. C. The growth of the Aitolian delegation from seven to eleven shows that the Aitolian League had again entered upon a policy of vigorous expansion. This is probably a result of the compact between Antigonos and Achaia which left Aitolia no longer bound by her former agreements and undertakings with the king.<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that the honors paid to the Chian hieromnemon mark the return of the Chians to the Council. The reason for their long absence, or for their return at this particular time, has not been satisfactorily explained. It has been suggested that Aitolia withdrew the privilege after her own great losses in the war with Demetrios and did not restore it until she had regained her former voting power in the Council.

<sup>1</sup> BCH 1902, 250 ff. SIG I<sup>3</sup> 494.

<sup>2</sup> Pomtow, *Jahrbb. Phil.* 1894, 530.

<sup>3</sup> Polybios II 45-50.

Since Patrondas must precede the Kleomenic war, he is to be dated in 225. Herys is later than Peithagoras as the decrees in honor of Antagoras show.<sup>1</sup> The Boiotians were absent from the Council, so Herys probably belongs between 224 and 222.

This arrangement of the group Thessalos-Herys differs widely from the chronological tables published by Beloch, Walek, or Pomtow. Its validity rests on our theory of the political attitude of Makedon and the Achaian League towards Aitolian domination at Delphi, and in no less degree, on the date which we have given to the revolt of Athens from Makedon. In regard to the latter point, it is only fair that we should consider the problem with reference to the other theory which dates Athenian independence in 229 or 228. In that case Athambos-Damosthenes should be dated in 228-6 or four years later than in our list. Peithagoras and Patrondas would fall in the interval of peace which followed the Kleomenic war and Herys in the Social war. Kallias and Nikarchos would have to be dated between 217 and 212. It is in this last period where we face difficulty. The expansion of the Aitolian League to its maximum power would be assigned to a period when all Greece was in comparative peace, and at a time much later than any historian has ventured to place it. It seems to us that our evidence, scanty and poor at the best, is all against such a late date and it cannot be lightly cast aside. Furthermore the grouping of the Soteric records becomes a very difficult and involved problem. Charixenos falls in an interval of peace and Xennias in wartime, and these *agonothetai* succeed each other in the order named.<sup>2</sup> Similarly another record of two successive Soteria shows that one was celebrated under peace conditions while the second shows that Boiotia and Aitolia were at war.<sup>3</sup> It is clear that all these documents cannot be placed at the beginning of the Makedonian war. Charixenos and Xennias must go back to the beginning of the Social war. Finally, some of the archons, who must be displaced from their present position in 217-212, will have to be dated about the middle of the century at a time when friendly relations between Aitolia and Makedon would permit honorary decrees for citizens of the latter. Prosopographic and epigraphical considerations are against any such change. In general, it may be said that the

<sup>1</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 498, 499.

<sup>2</sup> Klio 1914, 307.

<sup>3</sup> BCH 1902, 266, 267.



evidence of the Delphic inscriptions is in favor of the theory dating the independence of Athens in 232.

Our arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists makes it impossible to date the decree in honor of Lykon ca. 228. Pomtow is undoubtedly correct in assigning this document to the middle of the century or ca. 248.<sup>1</sup>

In dating the Amphiktyonic records later than Herys, we are on surer ground. Lists, in which the ethnic adjective is used, are undoubtedly later than those where it is not found. This divides the records into two classes, and is of great service in dating them. Secondly, the presence of Boiotian delegates in any list excludes the possibility of dating it during the Kleomenic, Social, or Makedonic wars. Finally, the growth of the Aitolian League helps to fix the date, or sequence, of some of the records. Unfortunately, the nature of this evidence is very unsatisfactory, and most of us are prone to date our documents first, and then make our deductions about the growth of the League.

In the archonship of Herys the Aitolians had eleven votes, and this number was increased to fourteen under Kallias. In his year the Aitolian League had attained its maximum expansion, although we also find records giving fifteen votes to Aitolia in addition to others which she controlled. Beloch places the period of greatest expansion between 228 and 220.<sup>2</sup> Walek and Pomtow have been more definite for they date Nikarchos and Kallias in 227-6. According to Beloch, Thessaly was divided between Aitolia and Makedon ca. 228 as a result of the good understanding arrived at early in the reign of Antigonos with Aitolia. If so, the increase in the Aitolian delegation was due to this arrangement. We doubt, however, if such a division was made. When Antigonos had to face a revolt of his troops, he won them over to him by pleading his success in quelling an uprising in Thessaly.<sup>3</sup> This plea could not have been made if he had resigned any of that state to Aitolia. Moreover, Thessaly is listed as an ally of Makedon in the Kleomenic war.<sup>4</sup> Polybios may not mean Thessaly entire, but it is probably the larger part. According to our arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists Aitolia only controlled eleven votes at

<sup>1</sup> SIG I<sup>8</sup> 461; GGA 1913, 168.

<sup>2</sup> Justin XXVIII 3.

<sup>3</sup> Gr. Gesch. III 2. 322 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Polybios IV 9.

the outbreak of the war. She may have added a part of Thessaly contiguous to her own boundaries, but could have controlled only a small part. It should be noted that Thessalian troops took no part in the battle of Sellasia, and in the conference of allies summoned to Corinth in 220 Thessaly was not present nor was she even invited.<sup>1</sup> We may infer that Thessaly abandoned her alliance with Makedon between 223 and 222, and those parts not directly controlled by Makedonian troops joined the Aitolian League. If this is the case, Aitolia could have commanded fourteen votes about 223 or 222. During the Social war Larisa, Demetrias, Pharsalos, Pherai, and other towns whose names are unknown were controlled by Philip.<sup>2</sup> Skotussa,<sup>3</sup> Lamia,<sup>4</sup> Thebai Phthiotikai and Meliteia<sup>5</sup> are mentioned by name as Aitolian. Philip failed in an attack on Meliteia<sup>6</sup> but was more successful against Phthiotic Thebes which he recaptured and refounded under the name of Philipopolis.<sup>7</sup> The dispossessed Thebans were given land in Lokris by Aitolia<sup>8</sup> and it is probable that in going to their new home the colonists believed that they alone had the right to the Amphiktyonic membership, which thus remained under the control of the League. During the war the Thessalian plain was held at times by the troops of Philip, for Dorimachos found his way barred by them once when he attempted a raid on Makedon, and so he ventured no farther than the mountains on the border. On the whole the war seems to have been indecisive and in 217, on the intercession of friendly neutrals, peace was concluded on the basis of the map.<sup>9</sup> It is probable that very little, if any, change was made in the membership of the Aitolian League.

Between 222 and 217 we place the archons Nikarchos, Kallias, and the agonothete Xennias. Fourteen Aitolians appeared in the Council in the records for these years, implying that the League had attained her maximum extent. This, we believe, is due to the defection of Thessaly before the battle of Sellasia. Since the Boiotians are also present at the Council in both archonships, we must date Nikarchos and Kallias in the interval of

<sup>1</sup> Polybios II 65; IV 15, 25.

<sup>2</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 501.

<sup>3</sup> Polybios V 97, 99.

<sup>4</sup> Polybios V 99, 100.

<sup>5</sup> Polybios V 100, 103, 105.

<sup>6</sup> Polybios V 99.

<sup>7</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 536.

<sup>8</sup> Polybios V 27, 97.

<sup>9</sup> Livy XXVIII 7.

peace. Pomtow shows that Xennias is later than Kallias,<sup>1</sup> and since the Boiotians are absent when he presided over the Soteria, Xennias must be dated during the Social war, probably in the year immediately following Kallias.

We have set forth elsewhere our reasons for believing that there were two archons named Nikarchos, one of whom must antedate the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens.<sup>2</sup> The results of our investigations in the later period substantiate this theory, for Nikarchos II cannot be earlier than 223 when it is certain that Ptolemais existed at Athens. It should be noted here that Pomtow has recently dated the archon Archelas in ca. 238.<sup>3</sup> The hieromnemons under Nikarchos were Hippon and Antandros. Both names appear as senators under Archelas and it is evident that they are the same men. If Pomtow is correct in dating Archelas so early, Nikarchos II must be identified with Nikarchos I and dated along with him in 240. In other words, it would be necessary to assume that the Aitolian League had attained its maximum growth at the beginning of the reign of Demetrios. Such a theory has some merit, for it is not impossible, and it might be used to explain the origin of the war between Demetrios and Aitolia. On the other hand, it would be necessary to explain the presence of the Boiotian delegates at the Council. After the battle of Chaironeia Boiotia would have surrendered her votes to Aitolia, if we may judge by Aitolian practice elsewhere. But it is uncertain whether she became a member of the League or joined Aitolia on the basis of an independent ally. If the latter, she would have retained her voting privileges. However, with the evidence now at our command, we prefer to date Archelas and Nikarchos much later. The Amphiktyonic decree from the archonship of the latter confers honors on two men whose ethnic is given as Aigieus. If these men are citizens of Aigion, the capital of the Achaian League, the decree must be dated at a time when Aitolia was on friendly terms with the League. Very soon after the end of the Kleomenic war, Aitolia began openly to plot against Achaia, and strained relations would have prevented the Council from honoring Achaians. Accordingly, the honorary decree must have been passed immediately on the conclusion of the war or else some years later, after the Social war. We have already

<sup>1</sup> Klio 1914, 306-7.

<sup>2</sup> AJP 1918, 165.

<sup>3</sup> Klio 1917, 43.

shown that it is difficult to date Nikarchos in the later period, and we therefore prefer to place him immediately at the close of the Kleomenic war.

In the peace which followed the Social war we date two records of the Soteria.<sup>1</sup> In the Amphiktyonic lists the ethnic adjective is not given and the Boiotians are present at the Council. The number of Aitolian delegates shows that the League had expanded slightly, and we believe that these documents should be placed as near the beginning of the Makedonian war as possible. We have accepted the restorations of Nikitsky and Pomtow by which Aitolia is given fifteen delegates at the Council. It is possible that only fourteen were present, for the very fragmentary condition of the documents does not allow exact determination.

In the Amphiktyonic records belonging to the last period, the Aitolians adopted the practice of giving the place of origin of their delegates. Fortunately we can determine when they introduced this plan. An inscription from Delphi gives two lists which undoubtedly belong in successive years.<sup>2</sup> In the first of these the Boiotians were present at the Council, and absent in the second. We must infer from this that war had broken out in the interval between the two celebrations of the Soteria. There is no doubt that the document falls at the beginning of the Makedonian war, since the Kleomenic and Social wars are excluded from consideration. The alliance between Rome and Aitolia was formed at the end of the campaigning season in 212, or after the performance of the Soteria in that year. Livy tells us that the Roman commander who negotiated the alliance, returned from Aitolia to his winter-quarters, and that Philip heard the news while wintering in Pella.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly, we may date the first of these Amphiktyonic records in 212 and the second in 211. Since the ethnic adjective is found in the second and not in the first, we may date the new custom in 211. Aitolia apparently inaugurated the plan as a means of conferring honor on those individuals or states which had rendered conspicuous service to the League. In some cases citizens of states not members of the League were appointed as Aitolian hieromnemons. These were probably pro-Aitolians who were living at the time in exile within the bounds of the League. We do

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 298.

<sup>2</sup> BCH 1902, 266-7.

<sup>3</sup> Livy XXVI 24, 25.

not understand the Aitolian practice in reference to Kephallene. Beginning with 212, citizens of this island were sometimes named as members of the Aitolian delegation, and sometimes they are recorded independently. The latter is an unusual departure from custom, for Kephallene apparently remained a part of the League.

The history of the Makedonian war is particularly obscure, especially in its relation to the membership of the Aitolian League. Akarnania, Epeiros, Boiotia, Phokis (probably only in part), and Euboia were the northern states of Greece allied with Philip at the beginning.<sup>1</sup> Thessaly refused to join him at first but is numbered amongst the allies at the end.<sup>2</sup> In a speech of the Rhodian (?) mission in 207, the orator gives Boiotia, Euboia, Phokis, Lokris, Thessaly, and Epeiros on the side of Makedon.<sup>3</sup> We may allow for considerable rhetorical exaggeration in the speech, for it is clear that parts of Phokis, Lokris, and Thessaly were held by Aitolia. It is possible that the same is true of Boiotia, for the speaker goes on to say that, when the war with Hannibal is over, Rome will direct its whole power against Greece: *professedly, indeed, in aid of the Boiotians against Philip*. This is a very strange statement, for we cannot understand why Boiotia should be made the pretext when Rome was already allied with Aitolia in a war against Philip. It may be that the text of the passage is corrupt. If not, we must assume that part of Boiotia, which was not, at all times, enthusiastic about the Makedonian alliance, had appealed to Rome for help. In the final treaty of peace between Philip and Rome Livy gives the allies of the former as Prusias, Achaia, Boiotia, Thessaly, Akarnania, and Epeiros: of the latter as Ilium, Attalos, Pleuratos, Nabis, Elis, Messenia, and Athens.<sup>4</sup> The inclusion of Ilium and Athens in the latter is probably incorrect.<sup>5</sup> Lokris and Phokis are not mentioned on either side. The treaty of the previous year may have divided them up between Makedon and Aitolia, and they, therefore, could have no voice in the second treaty. In summing up the war, Niese concludes that both sides won and lost about the same, and that accounts balanced pretty evenly.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Polybios X 41.

<sup>2</sup> Livy XXVI 25; XXIX 12.

<sup>3</sup> Polybios XI 5.

<sup>4</sup> Livy XXIX 12.

<sup>5</sup> Niese, *op. cit.* II 502, note 4.

<sup>6</sup> *op. cit.* II 502 ff.

From the Amphiktyonic records it appears that Aitolia lost two (or three, if we include the Kephallenian vote as controlled by the League) votes at the Council in the first year of the war. This is due to Philip's successful campaigns against the Dolopians and in their vicinity.<sup>1</sup> Thereafter the League controlled 13 (14 in 208) votes. Walek believes that Aitolia exercised the vote of every state which had ever belonged to the League even though it had ceased to be a member. The variations in the numbers of the Aitolian delegation during the war discredit the theory, although we are willing to admit that Aitolia was probably very liberal in interpreting the geographical boundaries of a voting state. In Phokis, in Lokris, and in the north the Aitolian holdings were probably slight at times but they gave a technical right to exercise the votes held by those states.

The following arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists between 214 and 202 is suggested:

213 Agonothete . . . . . adas (BCH 1902, 265; Klio 1914, 306, 307).

15 (?) Aitolians, (1 Chian), (2 Delphians), 2 Boiotians.

212 (BCH 1902, 266; Klio 1914, 307).

15 (?) Aitolians, (1 Chian), 1 Kephallenian, 2 Boiotians, (2 Delphians).

211 Agonothete Le . . . . . tos (BCH 1902, 267, 268; Klio 1914, 306, 307; SIG 1<sup>3</sup> 523).

13 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Chian.

209 Archon Babylos (SGDI 2528).

12 Aitolians, 1 Chian, 2 Delphians, 1 Athamanian.

208 Archon Damokrates, General Lattamos (Fouilles de Delphes III 2.86; Klio 1914, 309; BCH 1902, 270).

F. 11 Aitolians, 1 Athenian, 1 Ambrakiote, 1 Kephallenian, 1 Chian.

S. 12 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Athenian, 1 Chian, 1 Tanagran.

206 (Fouilles de Delphes III 1.351) General Agelaos (?)

12 Aitolians, 1 Chian, 2 Delphians, (1 Athenian).

<sup>1</sup> Niese, *op. cit.* II 484.

205 Archon Megartas, General Alexandros (Fouilles de Delphes III 2.134).

12 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Chian, 1 Magnesian,  
1 Athenian.

203 Archon Polykleitos (SGDI 2527)

12 Aitolians, 2 Delphians, 1 Chian, 2 Boiotians,  
1 Athenian.

202 Archon Philaitolos (SGDI 2529)

11 Aitolians, 1 Kephallenian, 2 Delphians, 1 Athenian, 2 Boiotians, 1 Magnesian, 1 Chian.

Babylos can be placed with reasonable certainty in 209. In this year the king of the Athamanians rendered conspicuous service to the League in his efforts to secure peace, and was undoubtedly rewarded by a vote in the Council.<sup>1</sup>

Ambrakos was taken by a force of Aitolians and Romans in 208. Philip recovered the place shortly afterwards.<sup>2</sup> The only occasion during the Makedonian war when an Ambrakiot could have held an independent vote must be the fall of 208. The decree dated by the general Lattamos must therefore be assigned to this session of the Amphiktyons. It may be noted that Ambrakia was apparently not enrolled as a member of the League but was given an independent status. This may be due to the influence of Rome, and if so, it is an interesting indication of what was destined to be Rome's policy in Greece.

The Athenian delegate reappears at the Council in 208, and the unusual honors paid to him probably mark that event.<sup>3</sup> Why Athens departed from the traditional policy of Eurykleides at this time we cannot tell. It is possible that his death may be dated about this period and Athenian policies had passed into other hands. The influence of Rome may have been brought to bear on Athens to abandon her neutrality and help Aitolia which was hard pressed. There is a record of a treaty between these two states which may belong here, although Pomtow is inclined to place it ca. 220 or 201.<sup>4</sup> If it is dated in 208, Livy is right after all in naming Athens as an ally of Rome in the

<sup>1</sup> Livy XXVII 30.

<sup>2</sup> Appian, *Maced. bell.* 3; Niese, *op. cit.* II 493.

<sup>3</sup> Fouilles de Delphes III 2. 86.

<sup>4</sup> *Klio* 1917, 7. If this treaty does not belong in 208, we prefer to date it ca. 201.

treaty of Phoinike. The new policy of Athens was consistently followed in the succeeding years, for an Athenian is present at all meetings of the Council for which we have complete records.

The absence of the Delphians in the fall session of 208 cannot be satisfactorily explained. The decree for the Athenian delegate is dated; first by the Aitolian general; and second, by the Delphic archon. The phrase ἀρχων ἐν Δελφοῖς may mean that this session of the Council was not held at Delphi but elsewhere. It is possible that Delphi was beset by Philip's troops, and her delegates were prevented from attending by the necessities of war.

The archon Dam(okrat)es must be later than 211 because of the method of listing the Aitolian Amphiktyons. We believe that the presence of the Athenian hieromnemon is a sufficient reason for dating the decree from the archonship of Damokrates later than Lattamos or in the spring session of the same year. Against this may be urged the fact that the name of the secretary of the Council is omitted, although the practice of recording it had begun again under Babylos. Furthermore, if both decrees are assigned to different sessions of the Council in 208, the Athenian delegate must have been changed in the course of the year in conformity with Aitolian practice, although this change may be due to other causes. The presence of a Tanagran at the Council in this year is noteworthy. He is not to be regarded as a representative of Boiotia, but rather, of a part of the confederation which had been detached and was temporarily allied with Aitolia.<sup>1</sup> For this reason the Tanagrans are granted a vote of their own. A citizen of Lebadeia is also recorded amongst the Aitolian delegation. This does not necessarily imply that this state had also joined the Aitolians, although that is possible, but we prefer to believe that the Lebadeian was some pro-Aitolian exiled for his political beliefs and now resident within the bounds of the League.

The Amphiktyonic record which we have dated in 206 belongs to a year in which the Pythia were celebrated. The list is very fragmentary, but it is probable that we should restore the name of one Athenian in line 5. There is a lacuna of fully 16 letters after the full restoration of the formula for the

<sup>1</sup> Secession of part of Boiotia to the Aitolian League is indicated by the speech of the Rhodian ambassador. Cf. p. 297.



secretary is made. The contents of the document show that peace had come between Boiotia and Aitolia, although, contrary to their wont, no delegates from the former were present. If we are correct in believing that a part of the Boiotian confederacy had joined Aitolia, they may have absented themselves as a protest against the action of the League. In the archonship of Polykleitos, however, we find the Boiotians in their old position in the Council.

A Magnesian appears at the Council in the archonship of Megartas. The Aitolians conferred this vote in the second generalship of Agelaos.<sup>1</sup> The date is much disputed. This general held office for the first time in 217. Then, he was a strong advocate of peace, and his election was likely due to his efforts in securing it. If he still represents the same party in Aitolia, he probably falls at the end of the Makedonian war. Moreover, it is doubtful if the Magnesians would press for recognition of their festival in honor of Artemis at a time when the Greek mainland was torn by widespread war. Kolbe dates the arrival of Magnesian ambassadors in the Peloponnese ca. 205, and it is probable that the visit to Aitolia took place at the same time.<sup>2</sup> We date Agelaos in 206 and Megartas in the following year.<sup>3</sup>

Philaitolos belongs to a year when the Pythia were celebrated, and, as he is later than Megartas, he must be dated in 202. Polykleitos may belong in 204 or 203.

The arrangement of the Amphiktyonic lists which we have adopted for the last half of the third century requires the regrouping of the other archons of this period. For most of these the chronological evidence is slight, although we are better informed on the political affiliations of the Greek states between 240 and 200. In some cases we are compelled to rely upon the vague and indecisive evidence furnished by prosopography.

Kallikles is dated by Pomtow ca. 238. We have also dated Euagoras and Peisilas in the period of the Demetrian war because the decrees from their years show that Aitolia and the Achaian League were on friendly terms. There is no place

<sup>1</sup> *Inscriptionen von Magnesia*, p. XIV.

<sup>2</sup> *IG V* p. XXV.

<sup>3</sup> Alexandros was general in the archonship of Megartas (*Fouilles de Delphes* III 2. 134).

for these archons later, when similar conditions prevailed, unless we are to displace some of the documents which we have assigned to 217-212.

Colin denies the existence of three archons named Eudokos in the third century and Pomtow is inclined to accept his conclusions.<sup>1</sup> Since a large number of decrees for Aitolian allies in the Peloponnese were passed in this archonship, we believe that it is better to date them in the Demetrian war as recognition of services rendered during the struggle. Eudokos III should be dated about 236-5 or at the end of the war. It is probable that Athanion should be assigned to the same period. Baunack would date this archon after Thessalos because of the order in which the inscriptions follow each other on the stone.<sup>2</sup> This is not decisive proof, for the upper one might have been cut later.

The decrees from the archonship of Eudoros show that Makedon and Achaia were both on friendly terms with Aitolia.<sup>3</sup> They must be dated early in the reign of Antigonos, and it is probable that Eudoros is the immediate successor of Pleiston.

Lyson is later than the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens and earlier than the outbreak of the Kleomenic war. The latter is shown by the decree for a citizen of Stymphalos, a state which remained steadily loyal to the Achaian League.<sup>4</sup> If Peithagoras belongs to a year of the Pythia, Lyson must go in 227.

We believe that we should distinguish two archons named Xenokles. In one semester there is a decree for a Megalopolitan who is also called an Arcadian.<sup>5</sup> This double designation is never found in the second half of the century after Megalopolis joined the Achaian League. The last example occurs in the archonship of Charixenos in 267. This decree should therefore be dated in a period when Megalopolis was still a member of the Arkadian federation, or about 275. Xenokles II belongs to the latter part of the century for epigraphical and proso-

<sup>1</sup> SIG I<sup>3</sup> 418, note 21.

<sup>2</sup> SGDI II p. 694.

<sup>3</sup> Fouilles de Delphes III 2. 83, 84; SGDI 2635.

<sup>4</sup> Fouilles de Delphes III 2. 76; SGDI 2788.

<sup>5</sup> Fouilles de Delphes III 1. 36.

pographical reasons. In his year of office a citizen of Pheneos was honored by Delphi. Since this state joined Sparta in the Kleomenic war,<sup>1</sup> and was probably returned to the League of the Achaians at its close, we should date Xenokles II during the struggle. The only place available is 223. Another alternative is to substitute him for one of the archons in 217-212.

There is very little evidence for an exact dating of the archons between 220 and 212. Pomtow says that Archelas precedes Phainis.<sup>2</sup> The latter probably belongs in 217 or the end of the Social war. Several citizens of different states are honored in one decree, and it is a reasonable inference that they are mercenaries who served in the war.<sup>3</sup> Aristion II, Alexarchos, and Battos must be dated in the interval of peace which followed the war.<sup>4</sup> Kriton and Xenon may be contemporaneous with the archon Chairephon at Athens, when embassies passed between the latter state and Aitolia.<sup>5</sup> Of Phrikidas nothing definite can be said at present.<sup>6</sup> Pomtow places him ca. 219.

Bourguet shows that Anaxandridas precedes Nikodamos, although it is not necessary to assume that the two archons are in consecutive years. Nikodamos does not belong to a year of the Pythic games, if a decree from his archonship is correctly restored.<sup>7</sup> Both of these men probably held office at the beginning of the Makedonian war. Pomtow dates Archelaos during the Social war but we believe that he should more fittingly be placed during the Makedonian war.<sup>8</sup> The decrees from his archonship in honor of the Aitolian *epimeletai* imply that they were of great service in defending the shrine. During the Social war Delphi was not in danger, but Philip was more daring in the second war and made many successful dashes into Aitolian territory. The honorary decrees for Messenian mercenaries imply that the League was compelled to call upon her Peloponnesian allies for assistance. These decrees were

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. III 1. 39-42; Plutarch, Kleom. 17; Arat. 39.

<sup>2</sup> The Amphiktyonic decree published by Pomtow in *Klio* 1914, 308, may belong in the archonship of Archelas or Aristion.

<sup>3</sup> SGDI 2609.

<sup>4</sup> BCH 1882, 234: 1899, 554; SGDI 2625-6.

<sup>5</sup> IG II 619b.

<sup>6</sup> *Klio* 1917, 40 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Fouilles de Delphes III 1. 327.

<sup>8</sup> *Klio* 1917, 41 ff.

passed in the archonship of Alexeas and he is probably to be dated in the year following Damokrates or else at the close of the war. We follow Pomtow in dating Alexeas in 207 and Kalleidas in 206.<sup>1</sup>

In the archonship of Kallieros the Attic Tetrapolis received an honorary decree, apparently in connection with the Pythiastai. If so, the decree must be dated when Greece was at peace. Kallieros probably falls between 206 and 201.

The chronological arrangement of the Amphiktyonic records and of the Delphic archons which we have endeavored to establish differs from those formerly proposed in many important details. The validity of our results rests on two political principles: first, that no member of the Makedonian Empire or of the Achaian League ever participated in the proceedings of the Amphiktyonic Council while it was dominated by Aitolia; secondly, when we find any state represented at the Council, that state must be free from Makedonian control at the time. There can be no doubt that Antigonos Gonatas pursued a policy of non-participation in the Council during his long reign, and the results of our investigations persuade us that his successors did the same. In approaching the study of the Amphiktyonic records from the point of view of these principles, the interdependence of Athenian and Delphian documents cannot be overestimated. For example, the date and length of the Chremonidean war can be determined accurately only by a study of both. In like manner the dates of groups II and VI of the Council's records are closely bound up with the problem of Athenian independence. Finally, the dates of certain Delphic archons and of the creation of the tribe Ptolemais at Athens are determined by a study of both, for the problems are interdependent. Even if these studies have served no other purpose, we hope that they may help to emphasize the close relation of the epigraphical records of Delphi and Athens in the most obscure period of their history.

#### DELPHIAN ARCHONS, SENATORS, AND HIEROMNEMONS.

239 *Peisilas* S. Agelochos, Euphrantos, Chairikon.

238 *Kallikles* S. Kriton, Pleiston, Achaimenes, Hippias, Kleon.  
S. Damaios, Eurymedes, Xenodamos, Straton,  
Kraton.

<sup>1</sup> GGA 1913, 157.

- 237 *Euagoras* S. Damarchos, Teledamos, Dexippos.  
 236 *Athanion* S. Praochos, Xenon, Chares, Menes.  
 235 *Eudokos* III S. Alkamenes, Lyson, Aischriondas, Nikias,  
     Menandros.  
 234 *Thessalos* S. Agathinos, Kriton, Aristokrates, Amyntas,  
     Iatadas.  
     S. Hagnias, Eukles, Parnassios, Aristarchidas.  
     H. Eupolis, Kallikles.  
 233 *Eukles* S. Kleomantis, Athambos, Herakleidas, . . . . . on.  
     S. Xenodokos, Thrasymachos, Aristagoras, Menes,  
     Agetor.  
 232 *Athambos* S. Aristagoras, Damon, Pleiston, Nikias.  
     S. Nikodamos, Kleoxenos.  
     (H. Chares, Xenon)  
 231 *Damaïos* S. Hagion, Aristokles, Amynandros, Athanion,  
     Dioskouridas.  
     S. Nikodamos, Amyntas.  
     H. Chares, Xenon, Hagnias, Damarmenos.  
 230 *Damosthenes* S. Archon, Praochos, Parnassios.  
     S. Thrasymachos, Praxias, Kleon, Lysima-  
     chos, Amphistratos.  
     H. Hagnias, Damarmenos.  
 229 *Pleiston* S. Aristomachos, Eparmostos, Dropidas, Straton,  
     Archiadas.  
     S. Archidamos, Alkinos, Eudokos, . . . . . krates.  
     H. Iasimachos, Epicharidas, Ar . . . . .  
 228 *Eudoros* S. Diodoros, Pleiston, Echekratidas, Amphion  
     (?), . . . . ra . . . .  
     S. Erasippos, Nikarchos, Aristion.  
 227 *Lyson* S. Thrasykles, Kleon, Aristomachos, Sotion.  
     S. Aristion, Asopodoros, Philondas.  
 226 *Peithagoras* H. Lyson, Zakynthios.  
 225 *Patrondas* S. Lyson, Nikias, Dion, Gnosilas, Euthydikos.  
     S. Erasippos.  
     H. Archippos, Herakleidas.  
 224 *Herys* S. Archelas, Boulon.  
     H. Polyon, Diodoros.  
 223 *Xenokles* II S. Anaxandridas, Larisios, Xenodokos.  
 222 *Nikarchos* II H. Hippon, Antandros.  
 221 *Kallias* H. Nikias, Orestas.

- 220 *Archelas* S. Alexarchos, Hippon, Antandros, Aiakidas, Kallikon.  
(H. Mnason, Babylos.)
- 219 *Kriton* S. Kallikrates, Phainis, Archelaos, Diodoros, Chairikon.  
S. Pythophanes, Mesatas, Zakynthios.
- 218 *Xenon* S. Kalligenes, Aristoboulos, A . . . . .
- 217 *Phainis* S. Echekratidas, Eukles, Euthydikos, Kraton, Kleon.
- 216 *Aristion* S. Aristagoras, Rhodios, Eukrates, . . . . ondas.  
S. Nikaïos, Hagion, Kallikon.
- 215 *Alexarchos* S. Damotimos, Teledamos, Sokrates, Eukles, Euthydikos.  
S. Phainis, Archiadas, Hagion.
- 214 *Battos* S. Kleudamos, Orestas, Archon, Zeneas, Apollonios.
- 213 *Phrikidas* S. Lysagoras, Emmenidas, Aristomachos, Pleiston, Babylos.
- 212 *Anaxandridas* S. Hippon, Mnasiatheos, Nikias, Polyon, Ateisidas.
- 211 *Nikodamos* S. Ariston, Nikodamos, Pleiston, Xenon, Epicharidas.  
S. Amyntas, Kleotimos, Etymondas, Amyntas, . . . . . os.  
H. Philoxenos, Herakleidas.
- 210 *Archelaos* S. Tarantinos, Glaukos, Babylos, Orthaios, Nikodamos.  
S. Archiadas, Kalligenes, Euaggelos, A . . . . .
- 209 *Babylos* H. . . . . goras.
- 208 *Damokrates* S. Hagion, Aristomachos, Eudoros, Alexarchos.  
S. Herakon, Andronikos.  
H. Herias, Lysi . . . . .
- 207 *Alexeas* S. Lysimachos, Archelas, Lysidamos, Euthydikos, Archelas.
- 206 *Kalleidas* S. Boulon, Aristagoras, Ekephylos, Lysimachos, Aristoboulos.  
H. Teledamos, Emmenidas.

- 205 Megartas S. Mnasitheos, Protarchos, Athambos, Philinos,  
Nikoboulos.  
H. Praochos, Patreas.
- 204 *Kallieros* S. Parnassios, Archon, Aristomachos, Kleo-  
damos, Eucharidas.
- 203 Polykleitos S. . . . . eles.  
H. Parnassios, Babylos.
- 202 Philaitolos H. Aristomachos, Kallikrates.

ALLAN CHESTER JOHNSON.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.